

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Responsive to the Office Action dated February 8, 2005, Applicant hereby makes the following response. Claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 have been amended. Accordingly, Claims 1-24 remain pending for prosecution with Claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 being independent.

I. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

A. Rejection of Claims 1-6 and 13-18 over Ishigami

Claims 1-6 and 13-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Publication No. 10-191168 to Fuji et al. as translated by U.S. Patent No. 6,452,634 to Ishigami et al.. For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that Ishigami does not anticipate Applicant's invention as claimed because Ishigami fails to teach every element and limitation of the claims at issue. In particular, with regard to Claims 1 and 13 and the claims depending therefrom, Ishigami fails to disclose electrodes connected to four different driving pulse lines. As shown in Figure 10, Ishigami teaches four electrodes corresponding to one vertical line of photosensor series are connected to two driving pulse lines and driven by two independent pulse signals. Moreover, Ishigami fails to disclose that these electrodes are electrically independent of one another as claimed by Applicant. Ishigami instead teaches that the electrodes 7s and 7t are connected to one another through a driving pulse line. Therefore, electrodes 7s and 7t are not electrically independent of one another. Therefore, because Ishigami does not teach all of the elements of Applicant's independent Claims 1 and 13 and the claims depending therefrom, Ishigami does not anticipate the present invention as claimed.

B. Rejection of Claims 7-9 over Murayama

Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,750,042 to Murayama et al.. For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that Murayama does not anticipate Applicant's invention as claimed because Murayama fails to teach every element and limitation of the claims at issue. In particular, Murayama teaches two electrodes (in horizontal CCD) per one vertical photosensor line and it is only the two electrodes that are independently connected to two different pulse lines. Murayama does not disclose that electrodes corresponding to each of the vertical CCD registers are electrically independent from one another and connected to different driving pulse lines. Therefore, because Murayama does not teach all of the elements of Applicant's independent Claim 7 and the claims depending therefrom, Murayama does not anticipate the present invention as claimed.

II. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10-12 and 19-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,750,042 to Murayama et al. in view of Japanese Publication No. 10-191168 to Fuji as translated by U.S. Patent No. 6,452,634 to Ishigami et al.. For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable

expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

As discussed above in connection with the rejections under § 102(b), both Murayama and Ishigami fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention. In particular, Murayama teaches two electrodes (in horizontal CCD) per one vertical photosensor line and it is only the two electrodes that are independently connected to two different pulse lines. Murayama does not teach or suggest that electrodes corresponding to each of the vertical CCD registers are electrically independent from one another and connected to different driving pulse lines. as claimed in independent Claims 7 and 19.

Ishigami fails to disclose electrodes connected to four different driving pulse lines. As shown in Figure 10, Ishigami teaches four electrodes corresponding to one vertical line of photosensor series are connected to two driving pulse lines and driven by two independent pulse signals. Moreover, Ishigami fails to disclose that these electrodes are electrically independent of one another as claimed by Applicant. Ishigami instead teaches that the electrodes 7s and 7t are connected to one another through a driving pulse line. Therefore, electrodes 7s and 7t are not electrically independent of one another as also claimed in independent Claims 7 and 19. Thus, because both Murayama and Ishigami, independently or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of Claims 10-12 and 19-24, the cited references do not render the present invention obvious.

III. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and believes that the claims as presented represent allowable subject matter. If the Examiner desires, Applicant's attorney is ready for a telephone interview to expedite prosecution. As always, the Examiner is free to call the undersigned at 816.460.2516. Should any fees be necessitated by this response, the

Serial No. 10/060,544
Amendment/Reply to 02/08/05 Office Action

Atty Docket No. 09792909.5333
Express Mail No. EV 570964671 US

Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any such fees from Deposit Account No. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

By

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lara Dickey Lewis".

Lara Dickey Lewis, Reg. No. 48,161
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
816-460-2516 (telephone)
816-531-7545 (facsimile)

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT